· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/972,226	LANDER, VADIM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Eleni A. Shiferaw	2136
All Participants:	Status of Application	on:
(1) <u>Eleni A. Shiferaw</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Luke K. Pedersen</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 21 August 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	icant's representative)	
Part I.		. ·
Rejection(s) discussed: final action mailed on 04/11/2007	·	
Claims discussed: 1-2, 12, 18, 23, and 28		
Prior art documents discussed: US 7016875		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	The examiner will provide e record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
38		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representa	ative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Requsting approval for examiner's amendment for 112 problems and amending claims to particularly point out the invention (applicant showed where in the specification he supports the resource access is without a specified period of time). Applicant pointed out page 20 lines 27-30 and explaind his invention is session based but not time based. Applicant further explained the session based is only for current session that the user is on but not time based for example no logging back without authentication within 10min, or one day or so ..